

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9                   AT SEATTLE

10                   COLLEEN NUTTER, *et al.*,

11                   Plaintiffs,

12                   v.

13                   KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, *et al.*,

14                   Defendants.

CASE NO. C05-1910L

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

16                   On January 4, 2006, the Court dismissed plaintiff's claims in the above-  
17 captioned matter on *res judicata* and statute of limitations grounds and restricted plaintiff's  
18 ability to file *pro se* complaints in this district. Plaintiff has filed a "Response to Order for  
19 Dismissal" (Dkt. # 7), which the Court construes as a timely motion for reconsideration under  
20 Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Such motions are disfavored in this district and will be granted only  
21 upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which  
22 could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier without reasonable diligence."  
23 Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has not met this burden. It does not matter why plaintiff  
24 initially filed her suit in the District Court of Kansas: the adjudication of that suit on the merits  
25 bars this and all future actions arising out of the same transactional nucleus of facts. In addition,  
26

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION- 1

1 plaintiff has not attempted to show that any of her claims are timely under the relevant statutes  
2 of limitation. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is, therefore, DENIED.

3

4 DATED this 23rd day of January, 2006.

5   
6 Robert S. Lasnik  
7 United States District Judge

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION- 2